

Applicant hereby traverses the rejection. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to utilize the wastewater as the makeup water because *Fleischman* discloses that such would provide obvious economic incentives. However, the *Nakamura* reference neither teaches nor suggests using wastewater as the makeup water. In addition, *Fleischman* neither teaches nor suggests a water treatment method for a cooling tower as recited in claim 1. Applicant asserts that the *Nakamura* method and teachings of *Fleischman* do not arrive, even when combined, at the present recited invention. *Fleischman* only recites reuse of wastewater as cooling tower makeup. *Nakamura* teaches only a particular treatment of the water. Neither teaches or suggests a combination with the other. *Fleischman* does not suggest that there might be treatment of the water and *Nakamura* does not suggest that its treatment methods might be applicable to wastewater coolant.

The present invention recites feeding a makeup stream of wastewater containing organic and/or biological contaminant causing the side stream to pass through an electrolytic cell that performs oxygenation/reduction reactions using DC electric current for decomposing water and generating chlorine, removing solids precipitated by the action of said cell, and remixing said treated side stream with the main stream, before feeding them to said cooling tower. *Nakamura* does not recite that it could be applicable to wastewater as makeup water and the step of treating as taught by the present invention is neither shown nor suggested by *Fleischman*. Their combination would not arrive at the presently claimed invention. Applicant asserts that claims 1 and 8-13 are allowable over the combination.

In addition, claim 14 was rejected as being unpatentable over *Nakamura* in view of *Fleischman*, and further in view of *Hudson*. The Examiner states that *Hudson* shows that a sand filter is capable of being cleaned by back washing. The Examiner states that the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant asserts that the combination of *Nakamura*, *Fleischman* or *Hudson* would not be obvious. As stated above, the combination of *Fleischman* and *Nakamura* is not obvious and would not result in the present invention. Moreover, the *Hudson* reference does not teach or suggest combination with the other two references. In addition, *Fleischman* and *Nakamura* do not teach or suggest combination with each other or the further combination with *Hudson*. The combination of the three would not arrive at the presently recited invention or provide the advantages for treatment water and

refeeding the treated water into the cooling tower as taught by the present invention. Applicant asserts that claim 1-4 and 8-14 are allowable for these reasons.

Claims 5-7 and 17-19 were allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicant asserts that the claims are in condition for allowance. A speedy and favorable action on the merits is hereby solicited. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview may be helpful in this matter, please contact Applicant's representative at (612) 336-4728.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Dated: 5/19/03

By: 

Gregory A. Sebold
Reg. No. 33,280
GAS/km

